

**Excerpt from the
Monday, April 29, 2002
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
220 City Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415
4:30 p.m.**

38. 725 Vineland Place and 1750 Hennepin Avenue (7th Ward - BZZ-555, CUP)

Application by the Walker Art Center for a conditional use permit for a 650 to 700 space underground parking facility. (Staff, Jason Wittenberg)

Jason Wittenberg presented the staff report. He indicated that a letter was received from Ed Kodet who has an architectural offices across Groveland. He favored the project but had a lot of concerns about vibration associated with construction. He had apparently experienced some problems during the demolition of the Allianz Building. He also was concerned about the visibility and traffic associated with the loading dock on Groveland and about the potential for excessive lighting and also wanted to ensure that there was good access to the facility for users along Groveland Avenue. Paul Klooldt who owns residential properties in the area also called to support the project and wanted to make sure that Bryant Avenue was not being vacated as a part of this project. He noted the variance along Groveland was being amended from a denial to recommend that it be returned to the Zoning Administrator.

The public hearing was opened.

John Herman, attorney representing the applicant, indicated that John Cook of HGA Architects would discuss the design, but that they would be focusing mostly on the condition that was not acceptable to them that the loading dock be reconfigured in the ways suggested in the staff report. Second, Mike Sachi would be speaking on behalf of the City which was the real party and interest with respect to the parking structure. The Walker, under their parking agreement, applies for the permits for that structure. They thought all of the conditions there were acceptable. Kathy Holbreck would speak about the overall goal of the project and its design.

John Cook, HGA Architects, discussed an overview of the project design. He indicated that Mr. Wittenberg mentioned the paving and he wanted to clarify that it may have been misunderstood, but when they talked about paving he said that the majority of the Walker terraces were now granite pavers and it was not their intention to continue that idea literally, but they would be sensitive in the selection of pavement material for the Hennepin Plaza, the Vineland entrance and the loading dock. The idea being not to pick basic bituminous or concrete. Regarding the trucks entering and exiting the loading docks, trucks would enter from a right turn off of Hennepin. They were not allowed to turn left on Groveland. Any truck traveling Northbound on Hennepin would go to either the Vineland intersection and make a U-turn in the case of a small truck, larger trucks have to go down to Dunwoody and make the longer turn around, which was something

the drivers were used to because the current loading condition was not a good one in that trucks, large semis, have to come South on Hennepin, stop and back up across three lanes of traffic to get into the loading dock. They usually do that after hours so it ends up not being a major problem. They were remedying that situation by right turn off of Hennepin, trying to get the trucks in off of Groveland as quickly as possible through the 25 foot curb cut, they would pull forward and then back into the space. The reason they needed the 35 foot curb cut and drive was for the truck to make a full and complete turn, not destroy landscaping on either side and pull out and end up in a complete lane without blocking the Westbound traffic on Groveland. Prior to that they talked with Public Works about a single curb cut, that was much wider, where they brought the trucks in, backed them up and out in the same curb cut. That proved to be unacceptable to Public Works and they had accepted the plan as drawn with the 25 foot and the 35 foot curb cut and driveway. The Barnes building was the existing brick with not many windows. The intention was to somewhat do the reverse. He summarized the exterior materials of the project. The box that housed the museum store, the restaurant, the performing arts studio and a special events space was back-lit Teflon screen skin. It was not the weather barrier or the insulating barrier, it was a skin that was set off of the hard skin, or insulated box of the piece they called the cube. There was a glow coming from behind and it was their intention to work within the City zoning requirements for lighting buildings and not affecting adjacent property owners.

Commissioner Tucker asked if they had any strategies for the loading dock or had they explored that?

Mr. Cook replied that they needed to be very sensitive with not only the traffic views from vehicles, the neighbors were extra sensitive to it because they have a loading dock in their garden. They didn't want to have trucks and service vehicles disrupting someone's experience in the garden. Although Mr. Wittenberg talked about screening and protecting people not using the museum, they also had the same problem from the garden. It was a major design challenge. They had not discussed whether they do it with walls or fences or vegetation or a combination. They were acutely aware of all of the issues. He would leave it until their landscape architect came forward with some solutions and they could present them to the Commission later. He showed where Mr. Kodet's office was and how they viewed the loading area. They had been very strategic with the curb cuts and with the screening that would not allow Mr. Kodet to see much in the way of any activity going on. Also, as staff pointed out, with the center portion being low, the two "towers" were the tower of the existing Barnes building (walker) and the tower of the cube, he would get some views between them to downtown, as would other people, the art gallery, the church and the residences.

President Martin asked where the entrance to the public garage was?

Mr. Cook displayed the vehicular entrance, in and out off of Vineland. If you were coming to visit a neighbor of the Walker and had parked, you could go out the garden entrance or the South entrance, then onto Hennepin and walk around.

Commissioner Tucker - inaudible.

Mr. Cook replied once the Guthrie was gone, which was planned to be Winter 2004/2005 season, they would probably need the spring and the summer to do the fully realized landscaping plan. They would be looking at fall, 2005.

Maki Sachi, Minneapolis Public Works, indicated that Parking Services had been working on this project for the last year after it was approved by the Parking Review Committee. They were asked to do some analysis on the financial performance of the ramp and work with the Walker and their architects to make sure that the design of the parking garage complied with the City of Minneapolis' design criteria for parking facilities. They have been doing that. They have also worked closely with the City Finance Department to review the financial proformas and have a good level of comfort that the parking ramp would function well financially as a public parking structure. In the designs that they had seen, functionally the ramp would work well for its intended use. They were comfortable operating it as a public parking facility as part of the municipal parking system.

Inaudible question.

Mr. Sachi replied that the current schedule would be to start construction in the summer of this year. They estimated it would be about a fourteen month construction window, so they would be looking to open sometime in the fall of 2003. They would like to capture some of the existing Guthrie business and use to help the ramp in the early years.

Mr. Herman addressed some of the concerns that they had with respect to the loading area. It had been a very long and very complex design process. It was an unusually complicated project because they were dealing with both very difficult sub-structural issues with the configuration and the topography of the site. It was an irregular shaped site, a major existing institutional use that had to be integrated and dealing with trying to fit many divergent functional elements into the new project. Surprisingly, loading had taken a fairly substantial amount of time in the design process to come up with the scheme that they had and they thought it was a functional scheme and one which worked well on the site. It was not a loading dock that was simply a small area attached to the back of the building. The parking area undergirds it almost in its entirety and so the structural system of the parking garage in part dictated the structural system connections and where the loading went. They also had four or five major uses inside the cube which required pushing the loading outside of the cube to make the cube spaces functional and able to use the majority of that critical space at the ground level. Those included the book store, the escalation system into the theater, the gallery inter-connections and the connections into the garden area. That was what pushed it to be back toward the rear of the site. At the same time they had been trying to be extremely sensitive to the issues of visual impact on both Hennepin Avenue and on the surrounding, very few, non-Walker owned properties that were located along Groveland, particularly the Kodet Architectural building, but that was skewed so that its primary access was into the middle of the site, not directly over the property. As Mr. Cook pointed out, this property was owned and intended to continue to be owned by the Walker as part of their back office operations. There are a variety of rather extraordinary impacts if you ask them to do the kind of major design that he thought Mr. Wittenberg's suggestion entailed. Obviously they would have a significant delay in time and they were looking at bidding the parking ramp over the next 60 days. He thought they would have to re-think the structural system and

the exiting system of the parking garage if they rotated or moved back and forth the loading area. One suggestion was to rotate it back toward the building. The problem was that if they did that, it would rotate the functional supporting areas of the loading dock which were critical, but not very desirable to have right on the Hennepin frontage toward the front of the building into the areas that had been committed to the very high value public spaces, the book store, the galleries, the garden court and so on. The other suggestion was to rotate it away so that it faced into the center of the block. In a typical situation the idea that had been suggested by staff that the loading should be internalized more was a sensible suggestion, but the internal focus was the park area which would have extremely high and very valuable public use. It would rotate the parking away from a possibly very oblique view from a vehicle sitting at the intersection of Hennepin or somebody going 45 mph past Hennepin or a person coming to the corner, almost all of whom were making a right motion, onto Groveland and then a left on Hennepin, in exchange for rotating that parking away and into the center of the site. They thought that there were some very significant issues that would entail. They would have retaining wall and grade issues if they turned it into the park because it was sloping off very quickly in the down direction. They would have much more visual intrusion into the contemplative area of the park. Ironically, they would have more visual impact for the homeowners who were further west on Groveland, because as you rotate the space, you necessitate the maneuvering moving into the site slightly, so there would be more area that was surfaced and it would go around an unusual curve on the street so that the entry, particularly the far entry, had to move down and some of the houses then had a straight shot into the loading dock area. They thought it had bad problems that way. The trade off was what? At the present time, you have to think about the existing condition, not as the open lot, but what was there before. They previously had an entire surface parking lot right at grade with about 190 parking spaces, three entrances and there was surface loading for Allianz at the rear. After they were done, they would have 3/4 of the area, public open space area. Suddenly, instead of views of parking lot, the back of the Allianz building and the roof line of the Guthrie Theater, flat roof at the area, there would be a view down a terraced slope that was all grass, sculpturally enhanced with a very unique landscaping scheme. In terms of traffic on the road, Mr. Kodet had raised that issue, but there would be some loading traffic concentrated in the very small easterly portion of the site as contrasting to the current condition where there was pretty substantial cueing and parking at night, most nights for events. All day there was a jammed parking lot for Allianz. All of that parking was off site. They thought that the trade off's at best would offer very marginal improvements in visual impact to some motorists going past the site. They thought that the trade off would be adverse visual impact within the site. They were terrible trade off's for them in terms of redesign, potential loss of some functionality if they rotated it all back into the building and loss of park land and he thought a little worse visual impact on the Groveland Terrace owners if they went the other way. He would urge the Commission to not adopt the recommendation of the staff with respect to the loading.

Kathy Holbreck, Walker, stated that they had been blessed with an enormously involved team over the last two and a half years. They had eight members from the four surrounding neighborhoods working with the architects and with them. This was a process put in place by Council Member Goodman and she hoped that it accounted for the fact that they had heard so few negative comments about the project and its design. She thought the community had been very involved with HGA and also with Herzog and Demuron who won the Pritzger Prize last year after they were hired, which was akin to the Nobel Prize in architecture. It was very important to them that this expansion do a number of things, one was embrace the city and that was why the reorientation toward Hennepin, which was the original entrance of the Walker, was one of the first decisions the design team made and one that she was very happy about. They picked the design team because of their sensitivities to the urban conditions. One of the things that they had tried very hard to do was see this as a connector between uptown and downtown. Some people had asked why they were building on Hennepin if nobody walked. Actually, many people do go to the Walker not only in cars, they also come on bicycle and by bus. She thought that the diversity of the audience was in part driving this expansion. Since they last expanded in the mid 1980's, their audience had grown to nearly one million people, that included people who had made the sculpture garden as well, one of the ten most visited attractions in the state. The Park Board had really developed a unique partnership with the Walker over many years. They wanted to learn from that in terms of developing a town square inside of the building and an extraordinary building that linked the animation of the city to the contemplation of nature in the garden. When she talked about diversity of their audience as driving this project, she thought it was important to understand that Walker audience, about 1/3 make less than \$25,000/year. About 15% were people of color. 100,000 were teens who elected to go to the Walker, not through school groups, but on their own. It was that increase and that diversity of audience that she thought was making this project possible in the community. One of the other things that they really admired about the architects was that they didn't make "cookie cutter" designs. Each of their designs had a very specific look that had to do with the community in which they were building it, had to do with the clients needs, had to do with climate. If you look at their work, you'll see that this did have a lot to do with the Barnes building being a very minimal sculpture. You have no sense that things are going on there day and night. They really wanted to make symbolically the building more transparent and that had to do with the use of as much glass as the team had put in place. They wanted to connect with the city, they wanted to connect uptown and downtown, they wanted to connect the animation of the city and the contemplation of the garden. They wanted to make this more than a museum and she thought that with the sheltering of performing arts, new media, the web site of the Walker has been said to be the best of any cultural institution in the World, the Louvre came in second (www.walkerart.org). There were literally hundreds of hours of educational projects including collaborations with MIA and the Weisman. One of the major ingredients she thought had bearing was that the architects very early on came up with, unlike what existed before Allianz came down, was a parking lot and mechanical systems. This group of architects did not want any back door to this building. She thought that the very important aspect of the garden wrapping around the building was something that they very much wanted to hold onto. They also did want to help their neighbors solve the parking problem in the neighborhood. With the help of City Council

they did. The only thing she could assure the Commission of was that it was in their best interest to make this as highly successful and aesthetic, and social and educational experience as they possibly could. She thought the team they had assembled was not only sterling, but also extremely sensitive.

Julia Curen, 1724 Emerson Av. S, stated that she was commenting for the pedestrians in the area. As Allianz was, there was a green space on the corner and that was the only green space on the four corners. There was a lot of pavement and a lot of traffic going past. It was not very pedestrian friendly and she thought that this development had the opportunity to either make it even worse for pedestrians by paving it all, by making it reflect light too much and be glaring hot in the summer and cold and too sunny in the winter, or to mitigate that into used green space to make it more friendly for pedestrians whether or not they chose to go into the Walker.

Bob Roscoe, 1401 E River Pkwy, representing an organization called savetheguthrie.org. indicated he had been excited about what they had seen. The organization was very interested that they were getting a new building expansion and that they were also getting a completely new Guthrie on the river. That helped to add to the cultural resources that we already have. One of the resources we already have is the Guthrie Theater that sits on Vineland and that should remain. He wanted to remind the Commission that the Tyrone Guthrie Theater was recently called by the Minnesota Historical Society as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Unfortunately, he didn't see that reflected in the staff report. There should be a revised site plan to show that the theater remains in place. It looked like one of the entrances to the parking garage comes on the North and is within the footprint of the existing Guthrie. He would like to recommend that the Commission approve the CUP, but with the condition that the site plan come back showing that entrance removed from the footprint of the Guthrie Theater.

Mr. Herman replied that the driveways entering the parking garage did not intersect with the existing theater.

Aaron Rubenstein, 3249 Emerson Av. S, member of Savetheguthrie.org, member of the Walker Art Center and Preservation Office of the Minnesota Chapter of the Society of Architectural historians, indicated as an organization they supported preservation of the Guthrie Theater. He commended the Walker team for a very interesting design that he was looking forward to with one exception. The one big mistake was that there was a big green space where the Guthrie Theater currently sat. They strongly believed that the Guthrie Theater should be retained where it was in addition to the new Guthrie facility on the river. He believed it was within the Planning Commissions purview, because in the staff report there were references on the bottom of page seven, said that site plans shall include the rehabilitation and integration of locally designated historic structures or structures that have been determined to be eligible to be locally designated. The point was that the building had been determined eligible for the National Register in which case it would be eligible for local designation as well. On page ten, there was a relevant policy 9.4, Minneapolis will promote preservation as a tool for economic development and community revitalization. The implementation step was to protect potentially significant historic structures from demolition until the City could determine the significance of the structure and explore alternatives to demolition. That was from the

Minneapolis Plan. He believed the Planning Commission had some jurisdiction because the Minneapolis Plan clearly calls for preservation of historic structures and one of the findings for the site plan was that the site plan be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. He did not believe City ordinance said that the Planning Commission need not be concerned about the Comprehensive Plan elements if the City Council had acted contrary to the Plan. He was referring to the fact that the City Council had already approved demolition of the building, but he wanted to point out that the City Council did so prior to the State Historic Preservation Office issuing their report and their determination of eligibility. The Walker Art Center, like many projects and developers need to go through a number of development reviews and approvals, and that was one of them. The Heritage Preservation Commission last fall denied approval of the demolition permit and requested the Planning Department to complete a designation study for the building and that decision was overturned on appeal by the City Council, before the State Historic Preservation Office found the building eligible for the National Register. His request to the Planning Commission was that the site plan approval include a condition that excluded demolition of the Guthrie Theater. He thought there was a lot of misunderstanding and lack of clarity about why the Guthrie was historically significant in part because the original façade was gone. He asked if the Commission would like him to explain why the building was historically significant?

President Martin indicated Commissioners would ask.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Bradley asked Mr. Cook behind the Teflon, behind the lights, what is the permanent structure wall made of?

Mr. Cook replied it would be a white roofing membrane that was part of the weather barrier and hard surface of the insulated box. It was a white structure box that was not transparent or translucent. The finish material was a white membrane like a roofing material.

Commissioner Bradley asked if the inside was studs and sheet rock?

Mr. Cook replied yes, they have studs, insulation and several layers of sheet rock for acoustical purposes.

Commissioner Bradley asked between the membrane and the Teflon were there lights that light the Teflon?

Mr. Cook replied yes. The Teflon was stretched over a light steel armature.

Commissioner Bradley indicated in the letter from Ed Kodet he suggested that there be a pedestrian access to the parking lot off of Groveland. He asked Mr. Sachi if that was possible?

Mr. Sachi replied that currently the plan showed a stair tower coming through the parking garage that would exit out onto the sidewalk. He displayed the location. There would be no elevator, but there was a stair tower.

Commissioner Bradley asked if someone could get into the parking ramp from that entry?

Mr. Sachi replied yes, there would be access into the garage. The main entrance (pedestrian lobby) is at the corner of Groveland and Hennepin, with elevators.

Commissioner Bradley stated that he had heard staff's position and it seemed to him that the quickest way to resolve the loading dock issue would be to build walls around it at sufficient height, along with landscaping, to minimize the fact that anyone had to look at the trucks. The trucks would be trucks, that was all they would look like. They would park back there. In the winter they may not shut off their engines. They would leak oil on the pavement. In order to create peace in this city, build walls around it. He was willing to make that a condition of the site plan. He asked if the applicants were OK with that?

Mr. Herman replied that a wall for visual screening was one of the options they were considering. They would be happy to work with staff on that. They had also been considering very heavy vegetative screening. There were a couple of issues with walls in terms of being able to see through them, not having opacity. Most of the guidelines on the landscaping and screening want a reasonable amount of opacity for security. They had 15-18 feet where they could install landscaping in the center island which was a very large area. Along Hennepin they could consider a small wall. They would be more comfortable with a condition that they work with staff on an adequate screening approach that would include walls and vegetative screening to minimize the views of the loading area, rather than an absolute requirement that they do walls because it may turn out that everyone concludes that was not the best way to go.

Commissioner Bradley believed that was reasonable. When he said wall, he was thinking about something with spaces they could see through, a decorative architectural wall, not just a slab. Something that worked with the design. He would make a suggestion that they work with staff.

Commissioner LaShomb stated that he was not as down on the loading area as staff because of the visual impact. When he lived by Loring Park and walked by the Walker/Guthrie he never liked the Walker building because he didn't think it was very compatible with the community, but he always assumed that was the point that there were different expectations from the Walker than from the Minneapolis Institute of Arts and other places. The new design enthralled him even less in some ways. When he thought about the issue of the loading dock, his reaction was that the rest of the building was a major visual impact and he would probably never see the loading dock. If they could put something around it and make it look better and keep people happy, that was fine. He also thought the loss of grass in the front of the building would be a loss. Across by St. Mark's they have grass. They have grass at 510 Groveland. He didn't want them saying it would be like the rest of the neighborhood, that was not correct. What bothered him was that the major entrance was being moved to Hennepin. He wondered if the City had studied the traffic impacts. People coming from the North would be fine, they would be able to pull up and not get caught in the traffic. What are people coming from the South going to do? Do they go to the corner and make a U-turn and then come up? He thought the Hennepin entrance may create some problems. The loading ramp seemed to be the point of contention and he agreed with Commissioner Bradley that if they could do something to mitigate that and make the neighbors happy he was fine. He had a hard time telling them to redesign the building to fix the loading area.

Director Ballentine clarified for Commissioner LaShomb that people didn't enter the parking ramp on Hennepin Avenue. There was a place for pedestrians to enter on Hennepin Avenue and have access to the garage through an elevator system. The main entrance to the ramp and the only entrance would be on Vineland Place next to the current Guthrie building. There will be no cars on that portion of Groveland unless they were going to the neighborhood.

Commissioner LaShomb replied that there would be situations where a person may not be able to walk long distances and someone would try to get them as close to the front door as possible. If Hennepin's entrance wasn't important, why would they have an entrance there?

Commissioner Nestingen indicated he was going to address the parking ramp and several issues about the landscaping. As a landscape architect, he understood the predicament with the loading dock and thought it was a fine resolution. He suggested that screening of the loading dock be looked at as public art. Something that bothered him on the site plan was the whole front hard-scape along Hennepin Avenue. There was no landscaping and it appeared like there was street all the way from Loring up to the Guthrie and beyond and the loading and parking all blended together. He hoped there would be a great deal of landscaping going along Hennepin and that the issue about dropping people off was considered. Was there going to be a short term parking or drop-off lane on Hennepin?

Mr. Sachi replied no.

Mr. Cook responded that they had been in preliminary discussions about the possibility of having a bus stop along Hennepin that would include a lane to pull off in.

Commissioner Nestingen commented that there seemed to be plenty of room.

Mr. Cook indicated that was not a "dead" issue. They were instructed to begin that discussion with the Transit Commission and they hadn't done that yet. There was also an entrance on Vineland. Regarding the landscaping along Hennepin, what they were showing was an architectural site plan. That portion was also part of the landscape architects domain.

Commissioner Nestingen asked if there was not an intention to have complete hard scape along Hennepin, that was not a final decision?

Mr. Cook replied no, it was not a final decision.

Commissioner Nestingen added that they consider berms along the loading dock. The site is undulating, they might add more of that. Other than the things he mentioned, he would vote to approve the site plan.

Commissioner Young stated that she had the same issues. She believed there was far too much impervious surface on Hennepin at the pedestrian entrance. She suggested adding into the conditions CPTED (crime prevention through environmental design). She couldn't believe that there wasn't some crime on Hennepin in that area. She thought there needed to be crime prevention through environmental design. She couldn't go without saying that she hoped they made the building as energy efficient as possible and use any passive or active solar and maybe having some in the sculpture garden. Regarding the loading dock, that was where the CPTED was, but she believed it could be a green loading dock meaning landscaped well and using solar. They should make it attractive.

Commissioner Schiff agreed with much that had been said. On the site plan, having a bus lane on Hennepin or a bus drop-off, really changed the circulation on the site. It might be a good thing, with access to public transit. Then he would be interested in how a bus drop-off lane would affect the pedestrian environment. It would do so greatly and he was having a hard time imagining what that would look like. The staff requirement suggested that they come back for final landscaping approval, but as he understood, landscaping meant planting trees, bushes and shrubs.

President Martin clarified that it said approval of landscaping plan and design of all open spaces on the site.

Commissioner Schiff stated that there was nothing about impervious surfaces and a maximum or minimum. If they approved this, it gave them permission to build exactly what was in the picture. It would come back, but there were no conditions for when they came back about what a minimum or maximum would be.

President Martin indicated that those conditions could be added.

Commissioner Schiff replied that he wouldn't want to start "throwing out" percentages for impervious surface.

President Martin stated that could be part of the consultation with staff. It could be a direction to staff to take that into account as they worked with the applicant.

Commissioner Schiff stated that the bigger issue was the time span over the implementation of this plan. There was a 2003 version where the parking ramp would be open and operating for business and collecting revenue, while the Guthrie Theater was open and operating for business. Then there was the 2005 plan which was the image before the Commission. That was two different schematics. He would like to see a drawing of the 2003 plan for what the whole site would look like before they skipped that whole period and approved the 2005 plan. He would like to delay approval of the site plan and have them return with a drawing showing what the 2003 plan looked like with several years to look at this area and the neighborhood to be impacted by this area. He hated to leave that "fuzzy" and not to have responsibility for what that would look like.

Commissioner Nestingen added about the comments regarding the Guthrie, he didn't pretend to know all of the details about the studies that said that the Guthrie should go, but he had always hoped that there be some commemoration of the Guthrie in the landscaping. He didn't have a suggestion. It was an emotional subject for everyone. There would be a large space and there would be plenty of room for some commemoration.

Commissioner Tucker motioned, Nestingen seconded to adopt the findings prepared by staff and **approve** the conditional use permit application for a 650 to 700 space underground parking facility at 725 Vineland Place/1750 Hennepin Avenue, subject to the following condition: 1) The number of accessible parking spaces shall meet the requirements of the Minnesota Accessibility Code. **Carried.**

39. **725 Vineland Place and 1750 Hennepin Avenue (7th Ward - BZZ-555, CUP)**
Application by the Walker Art Center for a conditional use permit to allow a 350-seat theater. (Staff, Jason Wittenberg)

The public hearing was opened.

See discussion in item #38 above.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Tucker motioned, Schiff seconded to adopt the findings prepared by staff and **approve** the conditional use permit application for a 350-seat theater at 725 Vineland Place/1750 Hennepin Avenue. **Carried.**

40. **725 Vineland Place and 1750 Hennepin Avenue (7th Ward - BZZ-555, CUP)**
Application by the Walker Art Center for a conditional use permit to increase the maximum permitted height of a museum in the OR2 District from four stories, not to exceed 56 feet, to six stories/111 feet to allow a proposed museum addition of approximately 139,500 square feet and an underground parking facility. (Staff, Jason Wittenberg)

The public hearing was opened.

See discussion in item #38 above.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Tucker motioned, Schiff seconded to adopt the findings prepared by staff and **approve** the conditional use permit application to increase the maximum permitted height of a museum in the OR2 District from four stories, not to exceed 56 feet, to six stories/111 feet at 725 Vineland Place/1750 Hennepin Avenue. **Carried.**

41. **725 Vineland Place and 1750 Hennepin Avenue (7th Ward - BZZ-555, Variance)**

Application by the Walker Art Center for a variance to reduce the required front yard setback along Hennepin Avenue from 15 feet to zero feet for a portion of the proposed addition of approximately 139,500 square feet and an underground parking facility. (Staff, Jason Wittenberg)

The public hearing was opened.

See discussion in item #38 above.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Tucker motioned, Nestingen seconded to adopt the findings prepared by staff and **approve** the variance to reduce the required front yard setback along Hennepin Avenue from 15 feet to zero feet for a portion of the proposed addition at 725 Vineland Place/1750 Hennepin Avenue. **Carried**, Commissioners LaShomb and Young voted no.

42. **725 Vineland Place and 1750 Hennepin Avenue (7th Ward - BZZ-555, Variance)**

Application by the Walker Art Center for a variance to allow an off-street loading area to encroach into the required 15 foot front yard setback along Groveland Terrace for a proposed museum addition of approximately 139,500 square feet and an underground parking facility. (Staff, Jason Wittenberg)

It was determined that this variance was not needed and the Planning Commission recommended that the application be returned to the Zoning Administrator.

43. **725 Vineland Place and 1750 Hennepin Avenue (7th Ward - BZZ-555, Variance)**

Application by the Walker Art Center for a variance to reduce the required number of off-street parking spaces from 744 spaces (Walker Art Center with Guthrie Theater)/554 (Walker Art Center without Guthrie Theater) to zero based on the proximity to proposed underground public parking facility to be located on Walker Art Center property to allow a proposed museum addition of approximately 139,500 square feet and an underground parking facility. (Staff, Jason Wittenberg)

The public hearing was opened.

See discussion in item #38 above.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Tucker motioned, Nestingen seconded to adopt the findings prepared by staff and **approve** the variance to reduce the required number of off-street parking spaces from 744 spaces (Walker Art Center with Guthrie Theater)/554 spaces (Walker Art Center without Guthrie Theater) to zero based on the proximity to proposed underground parking facility to be located on Walker Art Center property. **Carried**.

44. **725 Vineland Place and 1750 Hennepin Avenue (7th Ward - BZZ-555, Vac-1380)**

Application by the Walker Art Center for a vacation of air rights from an elevation of 155 feet to 235 feet over a portion of Block 1, Lowry Hill, adjacent to Hennepin Avenue, between Vineland and Groveland to allow to allow a proposed museum addition of approximately 139,500 square feet and an underground parking facility. (Staff, Jason Wittenberg)

The public hearing was opened.

See discussion in item #38 above.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Tucker motioned, Bradley seconded to recommend that the City Council adopt the findings prepared by staff and **approve** the vacation of air rights from an elevation of 155 feet to 235 feet over a portion of Block 1, Lowry Hill, adjacent to Hennepin Avenue, between Vineland and Groveland. **Carried.**

45. **725 Vineland Place & 1750 Hennepin Avenue (7th Ward - BZZ-555, Site Plan Review)**

Application by the Walker Art Center for site plan review of a proposed museum addition of approximately 139,500 sq. feet and an underground parking facility. (Staff, Jason Wittenberg)

The public hearing was opened.

See discussion in item #38 above.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Bradley motioned to approve the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Schiff indicated he would make a substitute motion to have the site plan review come back to the Commission the next cycle because there had been so many concerns raised, he didn't feel comfortable getting all of that addressed.

Commissioner Bradley - inaudible. He indicated he wanted to review the conditions that the Commission suggested during the discussion - inaudible.

Commissioner Schiff made a substitute motion, Bradley seconded to **continue** the site plan review application for a museum addition of approximately 139,500 square feet and an underground parking facility of 650 to 700 spaces at 725 Vineland Place/1750 Hennepin Avenue to the May 13, 2002 Planning Commission meeting and indicated to staff to further review the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant shall return to the Planning Commission for a public hearing for review and approval of the landscape plan and design of all open spaces on the site prior to obtaining a building permit for the museum expansion. This review shall also include review and approval of the elevation of the entrance to the proposed parking facility and any other accessory structures such as egress stair structures and mechanical intake and exhaust structures;
- 2) The applicant shall work with staff to achieve screening to include walls, vegetation and public art on the loading dock area;
- 3) Paving materials of the loading area, including maneuvering areas and driveways, shall be of stamped concrete, brick, cement pavers or similar material offering greater aesthetic value than asphalt or plain concrete;
- 4) Curb cuts and driveways to access the loading dock shall not exceed 25 feet in width unless a greater width is approved by the Public Works Department;
- 5) The applicant shall submit a stormwater management plan for review and approval by the Public Works Department;
- 6) The applicant must have an approved Travel Demand Management Plan;
- 7) The applicant shall submit a lighting plan, study or diagram indicating to the satisfaction of city staff that the project will meet the lighting standards of Chapter 535 of the zoning code;
- 8) The Planning Department shall review and approve the final elevations and final site plan;
- 9) Site improvements required by Chapter 530 or by the City Planning Commission shall be completed by April 29, 2004, unless extended by the Zoning Administrator, or the permit may be revoked for non-compliance;
- 10) Staff shall review site design for CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) Principles;
- 11) A bus and vehicular drop off area on Hennepin Avenue shall be reviewed by the applicant;
- 12) The applicant shall consider including a commemoration of the Guthrie Theater;
- 13) The application is encouraged to look at alternative energy sources for energy efficiency;
- 14) The applicant is encouraged to consider the possibility of using salvaged and reused materials as a part of the project; and,
- 15) The applicant shall provide 2003 and 2005 site plans for the project.

Carried.